DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 418 SP 016 049

AUTHOR Dansker, Judith
TITLE A Conference on Validation and Dissemination (Daytona Beach, Florida, May 2-4, 1979).
INSTITUTION Southeastern Teacher Corps Network, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 50p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Data Collection; Educational Assessment; Educational Research; *Information Dissemination; Policy Formation; *Program Evaluation; *Program Validation; *Research Methodology
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

This document reports the activities of the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network's May 1979 conference on the validation of programs and the dissemination of information. Concerns of the meeting were: the establishment of procedures for program validation processes, the increased awareness of naturalistic data-gathering techniques for educational research, the increased familiarization of educational practitioners with programmatic evaluation techniques leading to validation and dissemination, and the use of National Teacher Corps Validation and Dissemination Initiatives. The conference sponsors also sought to establish an awareness of ideas for validation processes consistent with the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel and the National Teacher Corps Validation and Dissemination Initiatives, and to review established processes for validation in the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network with the eventual goal of developing new procedures. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED1864418

A Conference on Validation and Dissemination

sponsored by the

Southeastern Teacher Corps Network

APPROVED

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

May 2-4, 1979

Daytona Beach Hilton

Daytona Beach, Florida

SP 016 049

SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

A CONFERENCE ON
VALIDATION AND DISSEMINATION

MAY 2-4, 1979
DAYTONA BEACH HILTON
DAYTONA BEACH, FLORIDA

MAY 16 1980

SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

Conference Report

Prepared by

Judith Dansker

Produced by

SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

AUGUST, 1979

Burnett Joiner, Executive Secretary

Charlene Patrick, Administrative Assistant
for Office Operations

Judith Dansker, Administrative Assistant for
Documentation and Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Tables	i
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Conference Evaluation	6
III.	Implications	17
Appendices		
A.	Conference Program	20
B.	Conference Evaluation Forms	23
C.	Network Board of Directors	34
D.	Council of Deans	36
E.	Teacher Corps Washington Staff Contact Persons	38
F.	Task Force Planning Team	40
G.	List of Conference Participants	42

List of Tables

Number		Page
I	Ratings of Participants on Validating/Using Affective Processes	6
II	Ratings of Participants on Validating/Using Naturalistic Data-Gathering Techniques	8
III	Ratings of Participants on Techniques for Programmatic Evaluation for Validation and Dissemination	10
IV	Ratings of Participants on Status Report on the National Dissemination and Validation Efforts in Teacher Corps	12
V	Ratings of Participants on National Perspective on Validation: Implications and Recommendations for a Network Validation/Endorsement System	13
VI	Comparative Workshop Ratings of Participants on Knowledge Gained	15

I. INTRODUCTION

The Southeastern Teacher Corps Network is a regional organization of Teacher Corps projects which are located in the states of Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, and South Carolina. These projects represent cooperative educational efforts between twenty colleges and universities and fourteen local school districts (and their communities) designed to: (1) improve the educational opportunities available to children in areas where there are concentrations of low-income families; (2) encourage colleges and universities to broaden their teacher education programs; and (3) encourage higher education institutions and school districts to improve the quality of training and staff development activities offered to teachers, paraprofessionals, and other personnel. The Southeastern Teacher Corps Network was established by Teacher Corps Washington to serve as a support system and to provide needs-responsive assistance to local Teacher Corps projects in achieving their project objectives.

The director of each of the fourteen local Teacher Corps projects and the dean of the school or college of education for each of the participating institutions of higher education, comprise the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network Board of Directors and Council of Deans. These two groups provide

operational direction to the Network in responding to the developmental and programmatic needs of local projects. All directors and deans serve with equal authority to establish policy, plan specific activities, and approve the use of funds assigned to the Network to support mutually agreed to inter-project activities. The policies and decisions made by the Network Board of Directors and Council of Deans are subject to operational rules, regulations and policies issued by the coordinating funding agent, Atlanta University, and Teacher Corps Washington.

"A Conference on Validation and Dissemination" was sponsored by the Southeastern Network from May 2-4, 1979. Held in Daytona Beach, Florida, the event was attended by forty-seven representatives from the Network's fourteen projects. The conference objectives were:

--To establish an awareness of the procedures for validating/using affective processes;

--To establish an awareness of the procedures for validating/using naturalistic data-gathering techniques;

--To establish an awareness of programmatic evaluation techniques leading to validation and dissemination;

--To establish an awareness of the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel Process;

--To establish an awareness of the National Teacher Corps Validation and Dissemination Initiatives;

--To establish an awareness of ideas for validation processes consistent with the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel and the National Teacher Corps Validation and Dissemination Initiatives;

--To practice established processes for use by the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network for validation and dissemination; and

--To review established processes for validation and dissemination that the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network has formulated.

The Task Force Planning Team included Dr. Howard Fortney, Dr. Dorothy Leflore, Dr. Mark Richmond, Dr. Suzanne Kinzer, Dr. Burnett Joiner and Ms. Judith Dansker. The following sessions were included in the program:

--Validating/Using Affective Processes

--Validating/Using Naturalistic Data-Gathering Techniques

--"Lessons Learned" -- Implications for Project Validation (dinner speaker)

--Techniques for Programmatic Evaluation for Validation and Dissemination

--Description of the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel Processes (luncheon speaker)

--Status Report on the National Dissemination and Validation Efforts in Teacher Corps

--National Perspective on Validation: Implications and Recommendations for a Network Validation/ Endorsement System

In the Validating/Using Affective Processes session, the participants were asked to break into small groups. All other presentations were made to the total audience. One half hour was scheduled after each session for an activity called "Erasing the Question". This time was alloted to give participants an opportunity to dialogue with each other and with the speaker so that any unresolved issues could be clarified.

Preston Royster and John Evans were scheduled to speak on the program. Royster spoke after dinner on May 2 about "Lessons Learned"-- Implications for Project Validation. John Evans, from the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel (JDRP), was unable to attend and Walt Le Baron substituted for him. Le Baron reviewed a videotape that Evans had forwarded in which he discussed the JDRP. Le Baron then integrated this information with his own Teacher Corps experience and was the luncheon speaker on May 3.

The conference presenters included Roberta Hughey, Kristy Wray, Shepard Krech, Bill Castine, Connie Berquist, Jim Eckenrod and Susan Melnick.

Instead of the conference ending at 3:00 p.m., as was stated on the program, the wrap-up and final evaluation was at 12:30 p.m. This decision was made by the conference planners because of the dwindling number of participants (as is typical of may conferences on the last day, especially Friday) and because the afternoon work was inter-project and could, therefore, be pursued at the home site.

Evaluation forms were distributed after each session as an immediate reaction to the session would, potentially, be a more accurate indicator of the success or failure of the workshop and could be a valuable tool for future planning. The forms were constructed to be as brief as possible. Presenters also had the opportunity to examine the evaluations, if they so chose.

The evaluations for all workshops were exactly the same with the exception of the first statement, the workshop objective. Participants were asked to rate the objectives and eight additional statements on a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being the most negative indicator and 5 being the most positive indicator.

The statements referred to the knowledge of the participant prior to the workshop, the extent the workshop increased knowledge and skills, the usefulness of the workshop, the organization of the workshop, the clarity and expertise of the presenters, the responsiveness of the presenters to participants and the adequacy of the facility. Space was also alloted for written comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the workshop.

A copy of the evaluation form is in Appendix B. A summary and analysis of the data follow.

II. Conference Evaluation

In this section of the report, each session will be examined individually and in conjunction with the concluding statistical data compiled from the evaluations.

Session I

Validating/Using Affective Processes

(Presenters: Roberta Hughey and Kristy Wray)

TABLE I

Achievement of Objective	-1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
To establish an awareness of the National Teacher Corps Validation and Dissemination Initiatives	1(4%)	2(8%)	6(22%)	12(44%)	6(22%)	3.7
1. Knowledge prior to the workshop:	3(10%)	8(28%)	7(24%)	10(35%)	1(3)	2.9
2. Knowledge and skills increased:	1(3%)	5(17%)	8(28%)	10(35%)	5(17%)	3.5
3. Overall usefulness of the workshop:	Ø	3(10%)	9(31%)	9(31%)	8(28%)	3.8
4. Workshop organization:	Ø	Ø	3(10%)	10(35%)	16(55%)	4.5
5. Clarity of presentations:	Ø	1(3%)	6(21%)	10(35%)	12(41%)	4.1
6. Expertise of presenter:	Ø	1(3%)	2(7%)	15(52%)	11(38)	4.2
7. Adequacy of facility:	Ø	Ø	3(10%)	6(21%)	20(69%)	4.6
8. Responsiveness of presenters:		1(3%)	3(11%)	5(17%)	20(69%)	4.5

Meeting the conference objectives has an above average rating. The discrepancy between items 2 and 3 indicate that knowledge prior to the workshop was fairly low and was increased by .6 at the completion of the session.

The workshop organization and the responsiveness of pre-

senters to participants had a high rating. The workshop was organized to allow participants the maximum amount of small group interaction with facilitation provided by the presenters.

The strengths of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Very good structure (5)

--Time for sharing of problems and products (4)

--Good materials (3)

--Good affective climate (3)

--Well-presented (3)

--Interesting idea (1)

--Task-oriented (1)

--Practical orientation (1)

The weakness of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Too short (4)

--Lacked definition of "affective data-gathering" (3)

--None (2)

--Redundant for Teacher Corps participants (1)

Recommendations are:

--To explain/clarify all vocabulary that is not in common usage

--Be certain that the audience is aware of your definition of significant terms

Session II

Validating/Using Naturalistic Data-Gathering Techniques

(Presenter: Shepard Krech)

TABLE II

Achievement of Objective:	-1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
To establish an awareness of the procedures for validating/using naturalistic data-gathering techniques.	1(5%)	4(17%)	7(30%)	9(39%)	2(9%)	3.3
1. Knowledge prior to the workshop:	1(4%)	15(54%)	6(21%)	4(14%)	2(7%)	2.7
2. Knowledge and skills increased:	2(7%)	2(7%)	6(21%)	13(47%)	5(18%)	3.6
3. Overall usefulness of the workshop:	3(11%)	3(11%)	9(33%)	8(30%)	4(15%)	3.3
4. Workshop organization:	2(17%)	3(11%)	7(26%)	4(15%)	11(41%)	3.7
5. Clarity of presentations:	1(4%)	Ø	4(14%)	9(32%)	14(50%)	4.3
6. Expertise of presenter:	Ø	Ø	1(4%)	6(21%)	21(75%)	4.7
7. Adequacy of facility:	Ø	Ø	3(11%)	8(28%)	17(61%)	4.5
8. Responsiveness of presenters:	Ø	1(4%)	5(20%)	7(28%)	7(48%)	4.2

In this workshop, the expertise of the presenter ranked highest. He was also clear in his presentation and responsive to participants. The written comments indicate that, perhaps, because the speaker was not familiar with the workings of Teacher Corps, the direct application of his material for Teacher Corps purposes was obscured. This might have contributed to the 3.3 rating on the overall usefulness of the workshop and the 3.3 rating on the achievement of the objective.

However, there was a significant increase, from 2.7 (item 1) to 3.6 (item 2), in the participants' level of knowledge gained as a result of this presentation.

The strengths of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Competency of presenter (2)

--Relevancy of presentation to Teacher Corps (1)

--interesting (1)

The weaknesses of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Needs of the group were not addressed (4)

--Audience was not reached because:

--material was read (2)

--rapidity of speech (1)

--specialized vocabulary (1)

--lack of visual materials (1)

--presenter was not adequately introduced (who he was; where he came from) (1)

Recommendations are:

--Be aware of audience needs

--Be conscious of the level of expertise within the audience

--Give background information of presenter, especially one who has not participated in Teacher Corps events previously.

Session III

Techniques for Programmatic Evaluation for Validation and Dissemination

(Presenters: Connie Berquist and Bill Castine)

TABLE III

Achievement of Objective:	-1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
To establish an awareness of programmatic evaluation techniques leading to validation and dissemination	Ø	1(5%)	2(11%)	7(37%)	9(47%)	4.3
1. Knowledge prior to the workshop:	3(12%)	4(15%)	10(39%)	5(19%)	4(15%)	3.1
2. Knowledge and skills increased:	3(12%)	2(8%)	6(24%)	11(44%)	4(12%)	3.4
3. Overall usefulness of the workshop:	1(4%)	1(4%)	9(33%)	7(26%)	9(33%)	3.8
4. Workshop organization:	Ø	Ø	3(12%)	8(31%)	15(57%)	4.5
5. Clarity of presentations:	Ø	Ø	3(11%)	8(31%)	15(58%)	4.5
6. Expertise of presenter:	Ø	Ø	1(4%)	4(16%)	20(80%)	4.8
7. Adequacy of facility:	Ø	Ø	1(4%)	12(46%)	13(50%)	4.5
8. Responsiveness of presenters:	Ø	Ø	1(4%)	7(27%)	8(69%)	4.7

The expertise of the presenters was rated highest. In general, the presenters did a good job of organization, were clear in their presentations and were sensitive to the participants' needs. There was an increase in the participants' level of knowledge and skills from 3.1 to 3.4. This material was a review of ways to utilize statistical information so that the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel (JDRP) criteria would be met.

The strengths of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Very good presentations (5)

--Knowledge of subject excellent (3)

--JDRP's agenda clarified (2)

--Reinforcement of previously learned skills (1)

--Good materials (1)

--Emphasis on naturalistic inquiry helpful (1)

--Relaxed method of presentation (1)

The weaknesses of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Too advanced for non-statisticians, only slightly instructive for those with statistical expertise (3)

--Not enough handouts (1)

--More clarity regarding JDRP's requirement for experimental validation in juxtaposition to other modes that might have more viability for Teacher Corps (1)

--Overall needs for documentation should be presented first, with alternatives discussed afterwards (1)

Recommendations are:

--Consider the expertise of your audience

--Be aware of the kinds of presentations that would be clarified and enhanced by handouts

Session IV

Status Report on the National Dissemination and Validation Efforts in Teacher Corps

(Presenter: Jim Eckenrod)

TABLE IV

Achievement of Objective:	-1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
To establish an awareness of the National Teacher Corps validation and dissemination initiatives.	3(4%)	1(4%)	6(24%)	11(44%)	4(16%)	3.5
1. Knowledge prior to the workshop:	15(50%)	5(17%)	4(13%)	5(17%)	1(3%)	2.1
2. Knowledge and skills increased:	2(6%)	6(21%)	11(38%)	6(21%)	4(14%)	3.1
3. Overall usefulness of the workshop:	3(10%)	3(10%)	14(46%)	5(17%)	5(17%)	3.2
4. Workshop organization:	1(3%)	4(13%)	3(10%)	15(50%)	7(24%)	3.8
5. Clarity of presentations:	1(3%)	4(13%)	5(16%)	10(34%)	10(34%)	3.8
6. Expertise of presenter:	1(3%)	2(7%)	6(20%)	7(23%)	14(47%)	4.0
7. Adequacy of facility:	Ø	1(3%)	7(23%)	8(27%)	14(47%)	4.2
8. Responsiveness of presenters:	Ø	4(13%)	2(7%)	9(30%)	15(50%)	4.2

According to this data, the workshop increased the knowledge and skills of the participants from 2.1 to 3.1. The usefulness of the workshop was rated 3.2 while the meeting of the objectives was rated 3.5. The participants felt that the presenter was responsive to them; however, the organization and clarity of the workshop was somewhat lower and could have decreased the effectiveness of the workshop.

The strengths of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Well-organized presentation (2)

--Handouts were helpful (1)

--Informative (1)

--Presenter's knowledge of topic (1)

There were no weaknesses listed in regard to this workshop which would indicate that while there are areas for improvement (according to the mean scores), no glaring flaws were experienced by the participants.

Session V

National Prespective on Validation: Implications and Recommendations for a Network Validation/Endorsement System

(Presenter: Susan Melnick)

TABLE V

Achievement of Objective:	-1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
To establish an awareness of the National Teacher Corps Validation and Dissemination Initiatives.	Ø	1(5%)	1(5%)	9(48%)	8(42%)	4.3
1. Knowledge prior to the workshop:	2(9%)	5(24%)	6(29%)	5(24%)	3(14%)	3.1
2. Knowledge and skills increased:	Ø	Ø	5(22%)	11(52%)	5(24%)	4.0
3. Overall usefulness of the workshop:	Ø	Ø	5(23%)	10(48%)	6(29%)	4.0
4. Workshop organization:	Ø	Ø	2(10%)	11(55%)	7(35%)	4.3
5. Clarity of presentations:	Ø	Ø	2(10%)	9(43%)	10(47%)	4.4
6. Adequacy of facility:	Ø	Ø	1(5%)	7(35%)	12(60%)	4.6

Session V
Continued

Achievement of Objective	-1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
7. Expertise of presenter:	Ø	Ø	Ø	7(33%)	14(67%)	4.7
8. Responsiveness of presenters:	Ø	Ø	1(5%)	7(35%)	12(60%)	4.5

The expertise of the presenter rated the highest. The participants increased their knowledge and skills from 3.1 to 4.0 which would indicate the value of this presentation. The participants seemed to be satisfied with the organization and clarity of the workshop and with the responsiveness of the presenter to participants.

The strengths of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Good presentation (3)

--Very well-planned (1)

--Knows her material (1)

--Comfortable sharing atmosphere (1)

--Good rapport with audience (1)

The weaknesses of the workshop, according to participants, were:

--Restated some points several times (1)

--Session too early (1)

Recommendations are:

--Be aware of repetition that goes beyond reinforcement of an idea and becomes mere redundance

TABLE VI

Comparative Workshops Ratings
of
Participants on Knowledge Gained

WORKSHOP	BEFORE	AFTER	KNOWLEDGE GAINED
1. Validating/Using Affective Processes (Hughey and Wray)	2.9	3.5	+ .6
2. Validating/Using Naturalistic Data-Gathering Techniques (Krech)	2.7	3.6	+ .9
3. Techniques for Programmatic Evaluation for Validation and Dissemination (Castine and Berguist)	3.1	3.4	+ .3
4. Status Report on the National Dissemination and Validation Efforts in Teacher Corps (Eckenrod)	2.1	3.1	+ 1.0
5. National Perspective on Validation: Implications and Recommendations for a Network Validation System (Melnick)	3.1	4.0	+ .9

On each evaluation participants were asked to rate their level of knowledge prior to the workshop and following the workshop. Table VI indicates how the workshops compared with one another in this category.

Session 4, the Status Report on the National Dissemination and Validation Efforts in Teacher, had the greatest gain. Session 2, Validating/Using Naturalistic Data-Gathering Techniques, and Session 5, National Perspectives on Validation: Implications and Recommendations for a Network Validation System also had a significant increase. Minimal gain was recorded in Session 3 , Techniques for Programmatic Evaluation for Validation and Dissemination. Two of the workshops, The Status

Report on the National Dissemination and Validation Efforts in Teacher Corps and the National Perspective on Validation: Implications and Recommendations for a Network Validation System were updates. Conference planners had in mind to expose participants to recent material, since much of that information had not been formally presented to projects. Validating/Using Naturalistic Data-Gathering Techniques gave an anthropological perspective on collecting data and as such was unfamiliar to many people in the field of education.

III. Implications

Conference participants seemed to feel very satisfied with the hotel accommodations. This particular conference site was well-suited to the conference needs, both professionally and socially. The hotel was on the waterfront which permitted a view of the ocean and a relaxed, informal atmosphere. A number of restaurants were within close vicinity of the hotel and the hotel itself had more than adequate dining accommodations.

The expertise of the presenters was generally considered to be high although this skill did not necessarily correspond to the overall usefulness of the workshop or the meeting of the objectives.

The meeting of the objectives rated 4.3 for two presentations and was below 4.0 in three other presentations. This could indicate a need for more clarification and communication between conference planners and presenters. This could also explain why the ratings for clarity and organization were lower in the overall pattern of scores. However, it is important to note that each workshop showed an increase in the level of knowledge and skill after the presentation. It is possible, therefore, that this newly acquired information would have an application when the participants returned to their home site.

Presenters seemed to be consistently sensitive to the needs of the participants and established a climate of relaxation within which to operate. Participants seemed especially appreciative of the time allowed for sharing.

The individual evaluation of workshops can be a useful tool if the planners, project and/or Network are primarily interested in viewing the conference from the perspective of the individual presenter and his/her effectiveness. It also will indicate whether the objectives have been met; however, only the comments will suggest whether the participants felt that the objectives were, in fact, realizable.

In conclusion, the evaluation data suggests that the conference was useful and that the selection of presenters, while having some drawbacks, were considered by the participants to be well-informed in their field.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Validation and Dissemination

Daytona Beach Hilton
Daytona Beach, Fla.

WEDNESDAY — May 2-4, 1979

12:30 - 1:00	Conference Registration
1:00 - 1:15	Conference Overview and Introduction Dorothy Leflore
1:00 - 2:30	Validating/Using Affective Processes Roberta Hughey Kristy Wray
2:30 - 3:00	Erasing the Question
3:00 - 3:15	B R E A K
3:15 - 4:45	Validating/Using Naturalistic Data-Gathering Techniques Shepard Krech
4:45 - 5:15	Erasing the Question
6:30 - 8:30	D I N N E R Introduction of Speaker-Howard Fortney Speaker -- Preston Royster "Lessons Learned" -- Implications for Project Validation

THURSDAY

8:30 - 9:00	Coffee and Tea
9:00 - 9:15	Introduction -- Mark Richmond
9:15 - 10:45	Techniques for Programmatic Evaluation for Validation and Dissemination Bill Castine Connie Berquist

Conference Program
Page 2

10:45 - 11:15	Erasing the Question
11:15 - 11:30	B R E A K
11:30 - 2:00	L U N C H E O N
	Introduction of Speaker -- Suzanne Kinzer Speaker -- Walt Le Baron "Description of the Joint Dissemination and Review Panel Processes"
2:00 - 2:15	B R E A K
2:15 - 3:30	Status Report on the National Dissemination and Validation Efforts in Teacher Corps Jim Eckenrod
3:30 - 4:00	Erasing the Question

FRIDAY

8:30 - 9:00	Coffee and Tea
9:00 - 9:15	Introduction -- Howard Fortney
9:15 - 10:30	National Perspective on Validation: Implications and Recommendations for a Network Validation/Endorsement System Susan Melnick
10:30 - 10:45	B R E A K
10:45 - 11:15	Erasing the Question
11:15 - 12:30	Review of the Network Validation/ Endorsement System (Small Group Work Session)

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORMS

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

A Conference on

Validation and Dissemination

May 2-4, 1979

Please circle your response. We appreciate your comments and we will use them in planning other activities.

Presenter's name: Hughey and Wray

Check one: _____Director _____Documenter _____LEA (Specify)

_____IHE (Specify) _____Community _____Other (Specify)

Achievement of Objectives:

A. To establish an awareness of the procedures for validating affective processes.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

---

1. My knowledge of the information presented prior to this workshop was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

2. The extent this workshop increased my knowledge and skills is:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

3. The overall usefulness of this workshop for me is:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

4. The organization of the workshop was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

5. The clarity of presentations was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

6. The expertise of presenter was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

7. The adequacy of facility accomodations was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

8. The responsiveness of presenters to participants was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

STRENGTHS OF WORKSHOP:	WEAKNESSES OF WORKSHOP:

* Adapted from the New England Teacher Corps Network Evaluation instrument.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

A Conference on

Validation and Dissemination

May 2-4, 1979

Please circle your response. We appreciate your comments and we will use them in planning other activities.

Presenter's name: Krech

Check one: _____Director _____Documenter _____LEA(Specify)

_____IHE (Specify) _____Community _____ Other(Specify)

Achievement of Objectives:

A. To establish an awareness of the procedures for Validating/Using Naturalistic Data-Gathering Techniques.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

---

1. My knowledge of the information presented prior to this workshop was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

2. The extent this workshop increased my knowledge and skills is:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

3. The overall usefulness of this workshop for me is:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

4. The organization of the workshop was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

5. The clarity of presentations was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

6. The expertise of presenter was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

7. The adequacy of facility accomodations were:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

8. The responsiveness of presenters to participants was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

STRENGTHS OF WORKSHOP	WEAKNESSES OF WORKSHOP:

* Adapted from the New England Teacher Corps Network Evaluation instrument.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

A Conference on
Validation and Dissemination

May 2-4, 1979

Please circle your response. We appreciate your comments and we will use them in planning other activities.

Presenter's name: Castine and Berquist

Check one: _____Director _____Documenter _____LEA (Specify)

_____IHE (Specify) ____Community _____Other (Specify)

Achievement of Objectives:

A. To establish an awareness of programmatic evaluation techniques leading to validation and dissemination.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

---

1. My knowledge of the information presented prior to this workshop was:

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

2. The extent this workshop increased my knowledge and skills is:

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

3. The overall usefulness of this workshop for me is:

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

4. The organization of the workshop was:

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

5. The clarity of presentations was:

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

6. The expertise of presenter was:

   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

7. The adequacy of facility accomodations were:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

8. The responsiveness of presenters to participants was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

STRENGTHS OF WORKSHOP:	WEAKNESSES OF WORKSHOP:

* Adapted from the New England Teacher Corps Network Evaluation instrument.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

A Conference on

Validation and Dissemination

May 2-4, 1979

Please circle your response. We appreciate your comments and we will use them in planning other activities.

Presenter's name: Eckenrod

Check one: _____Director _____Documenter _____LEA (Specify)

_____IHE (Specify) ____Community _____Other (Specify)

Achievement of Objectives:

A. To establish an awareness of the National Teacher Corps Validation and Dissemination Initiatives.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

---

1. My knowledge of the information presented prior to this workshop was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

2. The extent this workshop increased my knowledge and skills is:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

3. The overall usefulness of this workshop for me is:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

4. The organization of the workshop was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

5. The clarity of presentations was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

6. The expertise of presenter was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

7. The adequacy of facility accomodations were:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

8. The responsiveness of presenters to participants was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

STRENGTHS OF WORKSHOP:	WEAKNESSES OF WORKSHOP:

* Adapted from the New England Teacher Corps Network Evaluation instrument.

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

A Conference on

Validation and Dissemination

May 2-4, 1979

Please circle your response. We appreciate your comments and we will use them in planning other activities.

Presenter's name: Melnick

Check one: _____Director _____Documenter _____LEA (Specify)

_____IHE (Specify) _____Community _____Other (Specify)

Achievement of Objectives:

A. To establish an awareness of the National Teacher Corps Validation and Dissemination Initiatives.

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

1. My knowledge of the information presented prior to this workshop was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

2. The extent this workshop increased my knowledge and skills is:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

3. The overall usefulness of this workshop for me is:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

4. The organization of the workshop was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

5. The clarity of presentations was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

6. The expertise of presenter was:

(low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

7. The adequacy of facility accomodations were:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

8. The responsiveness of presenters to participants was:
   (low) 1 2 3 4 5 (high)

STRENGTHS OF WORKSHOP:	WEAKNESSES OF WORKSHOP:

* Adapted from the New England Teacher Corps Network Evaluation instrument.

APPENDIX C

NETWORK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NETWORK

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Dr. Mae Christian

Dr. Howard Fortney

Dr. U. Eugene George

Dr. John Hansen

Dr. Amos Isaac

Dr. John Kampsnider

Dr. Suzanne Kinzer

Dr. Dorothy Leflore

Dr. Yvonne Luster

Dr. Edith Miller

Dr. Mark Richmond

Dr. Robert Scott

Dr. Marcy Szymanski

Dr. Elmer Tossie

APPENDIX D

COUNCIL OF DEANS

COUNCIL OF DEANS

Dr. Robert Anderson

Dr. Jack Blackburn

Dr. Nathaniel Boclair

Dr. John Carpenter

Dr. Huey Charlton

Dr. B.E. Fancher

Dr. Jack Gant

Dr. Leon Lessinger

Dr. Evelyn Martin

Dr. Joseph Martin

Dr. William C. Moran

Dr. Andrew A. Robinson

Dr. Wayman Shiver, Jr.

Dr. David Smith

Dr. Billy Williams

APPENDIX E

TEACHER CORPS WASHINGTON

STAFF CONTACT PERSONS

DR. WILLIAM SMITH, DIRECTOR
NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS PROJECT

MS. DIANE YOUNG, PROGRAM SPECIALIST
SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

APPENDIX F

TASK FORCE PLANNING TEAM

TASK FORCE PLANNING TEAM

for

A CONFERENCE ON VALIDATION AND DISSEMINATION

Ms. Judith Dansker
Dr. Howard Fortney
Dr. Burnett Joiner
Dr. Suzanne Kinzer
Dr. Dorothy Leflore
Dr. Mark Richmond

APPENDIX G

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Daytona Beach Hilton
Daytona Beach, Fla.

May 2-4, 1979

Validation and Dissemination

PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS
Dr. Mae Christian Atlanta Consortium 2930 Forrest Hill Dr., S.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30315	Chuck Fuller Constance Cottrell Robert Hatch
Dr. Dorothy Leflore Teacher Corps Mississippi Valley State University Itta Bena, Mississippi 38941	Dorothy Leflore Percy Washington
Dr. Howard Fortney Teacher Corps P. O. Box 247 Eastaboga, Alabama 36260	Howard Fortney Erby Fisher Sanford Colley
Dr. U. Eugene George Teacher Corps University of South Carolina Columbia, South Carolina 29208	U. Eugene George Nancy Hill Loretta McIntosh
Dr. John Hansen Teacher Corps 403 Education Building Tallahassee, Florida 32306	John Hansen Zack Wuthrich
Dr. Amos Issac Teacher Corps Miles College Birmingham, Alabama 35208	Amos Issac
Dr. John Kampsnider Teacher Corps 514 N.W. 77th Street Miami, Florida 33150	John Kampsnider Robert Testa Charles Divita Naomi Wiggins

PROJECTS	PARTICIPANTS
Dr. Suzanne Kinzer Teacher Corps University of Florida 293 Norman Hall Gainesville, Florida 32611	Suzanne Kinzer Roberta Hughey Simon Johnson Kristy Wray
Dr. Yvonne Luster Teacher Corps Alcorn State University Lorman, Mississippi 39096	Yvonne Luster Edward Buck Sandra Noble Elizabeth Johnson Wilma Green
Dr. Edith Miller Teacher Corps Auburn University 4032 Haley Center Auburn, Alabama 36830	Edith Miller John Morgan Landa Trantham
Dr. Mark Richmond Teacher Corps University of Southern Mississippi Southern Station Box 10005 Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39401	Mark Richmond Winston Markwalder Eleanor Theriot
Dr. Robert Scott Teacher Corps P. O. Drawer 829 Florence, South Carolina 29503	Robert Scott Nick Nicholson Jerry Hough
Dr. Marcy Szymanski Teacher Corps University of West Florida Pensacola, Florida 32504	Marcy Szymanski Frank Wittwer Norma French
Dr. Elmer Tossie Teacher Corps P. O. Box 487 Hastings, Florida 32045	Elmer Tossie David Mosrie Al Johnson

CONSULTANTS

Dr. Connie Berquist

Dr. Bill Castine

Dr. [illegible] Eckenrod

Dr. Roberta Hughey

Dr. Shepard Krech

Dr. Walt Le Baron

Dr. Susan Melnick

Dr. Preston Royster

Ms. Kristy Wray